ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ಎಂ. ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರಯ್ಯ (ಕಡೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದೇ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೆ. ಹತ್ತು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ನಡೆಯುವುದರೊಳಗೆ ಎರಡು-ಮೂರು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಬಾಕಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಊರಿಗೆ ಹೋದಮೇಲೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಒದಗಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕಷ್ಟವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇಟ್ಟು ನಾವು ಊರಿಗೆ ಹೋದನಂತರ ಉತ್ತರ ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹತ್ತು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವೇಕೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕು ? ಈಗ ನಾವು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಎರಡು ತಿಂಗಳ ಮೇಲಾದರೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ನಾವು ಸಭೆ ಮುಗಿಸಿ ಊರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದರೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಜಾಗ್ರತೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನೊದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ.

1 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಆರ್. ನಾಯ್ಡು (ಮಲ್ಲೇಶ್ವರ).—ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅನೇಕರು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ನಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೀತಿ ನಿಯಮದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯತನಕ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮಗೊಂದು ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಕೆಲವರು ಕಳುಹಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಒಂದರ ಹಿಂದೊಂದರಂತೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನೂ ಗಮನ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಾವು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಬಹಳ ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ನಮಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ವಿಚಾರ ಏನಾಯಿತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SPECIAL RESOLUTION ON STATES REORGANISATION—(*contd*).

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, the Special Resolution.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—The Resolution I moved yesterday is of great significance in the interest of the unity and the speedy development of India as a whole. The reorganisation of States has raised controversies and in view of those controversies we have to be careful. This House has not accepted the idea of one language, one State. It has been made clear repeatedly. I had occasion yesterday to quote from the resolution that was passed by this House in the month of December. That resolution embodies the desire of this House to maintain the composite character of the State. I am aware there is a section of opinion which swears by uni-lingual States. There is also an opinion that these uni-lingual States will lead ultimately to disunity, controversy, quarrel and dismemberment. We should do nothing which will either now or hereafter affect Indian unity adversely. It may be said that these uni-lingual States present no difficulties, envisage no danger for the country. I do not straightaway say that these States have brought into existence conditions for such a contingency. But the controversies, the bitterness, the quarrels that have been occasioned, are sufficient indication that if you do not mend it in time it is likely to go to extremes. Even sober friends of mine in this House for a time forgot what was their duty by the country. Every question has to be discussed and decisions have to be taken by a majority. That decision ought to be accepted by the minority. These are the fundamental principles on which democracy is run. Many of us in our anxiety to advocate our respective points of view forgot those elementary principles. There were abuse, controversies, quarrels, and even a little street fighting in this State. (*A Member.—Not in the House*). Fortunately for us, what has happened in Mysore State is negligible when compared to what happened in Bombay City, in Orissa, in Belgaum and other parts of the country. That way we need not feel hesitant to take a little credit to ourselves for sobriety, for self-restraint, even when our feelings are aroused to the utmost pitch. It is this House again and this State again that has to give a correct lead to the country. Many members of this House are of the view that if there is a bigger State in the South it will be for the good of the people concerned; it will be good for the unity and prosperity of India. There is another argument which is very seriously adduced by no less a person than Sri C. Rajagopalachari. He says as against the North Indian States which are very big, South India is cut up into pieces and he says it is balkanised and therefore it will not be

able to pull its way in all-India councils. If a person of the stature of Sri C. Rajagopalachari who has been our former Governor-General and who has been a member of the Central Cabinet, says that South India is likely to be neglected, we ought to take note of it. We cannot allow the love of our respective languages to dominate our minds and allow political inferiority to perpetuate itself so far as Mysore State is concerned, or for that matter, any State in South India is concerned. Strength lies in unity. He bemoans that formerly Madras State which was one of the biggest States in India was able to pull its weight in all-India councils so far as South India was concerned. Now Madras has been split up; it has now become a very small State when compared to other States in India. In area it is less than what Mysore State is going to be. So far as Kerala is concerned, if area is taken into consideration, it does not deserve a separate existence. The area is hardly 15,000 square miles. How can you have such a small State in area when we have abolished all 'C' States because they were small States? In a federation we must have States more or less uniform in size. The example of other federations does not wholly apply to India. Other federations have their own difficulties. Here in India, after the people became sovereign authority, they are re-arranging on a planned basis. Planning is the urge of the age as it were. If you want to plan, plan properly in every sector. You cannot plan properly in one sector and leave other sectors unplanned and haphazard. Administrative units are the very basis for proper administration and for working in the direction of increasing our standard of life and economic prosperity. If you do not bring some plan and method to bear upon the reorganisation of States, you will have planned in vain in other sectors. I therefore plead that in the existing conditions of India, bigger States give more scope and more hope for our future. When you have States of the size of U.P., Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh, you cannot have a State of a population of about two crores or an area of about 15,000 square miles. You will feel small, not when you sit in this Assembly, but when you sit in Parliament along with others. When you sit in committees and councils at the all-India level, you will meet there the representatives of other States. Inevitably, smaller States will develop an inferiority complex and will not be able to summon courage and confidence enough to argue their case properly. That is the experience of all of us who go and sit in commissions and councils at the all-India level. After all, in a big country like India, every person must have his share of the good things of life. He is entitled to equal consideration. In the Constitution principles of equality in all fields of administration are guaranteed. That constitutional provision is not working to the satisfaction of all in practice. It is for us in South India to see clearly what our position is. It is our duty to improve it so that we may sit, talk and collaborate in terms of equality with others. This question of language is a mirage which should not come in the way of our broader thinking and dispassionate approach to problems. Never before in the history of this country was there any linguistic status as such. Many other circumstances went to determine the boundaries of States. To begin with, it was the conqueror's courage. Whatever territory he conquered he made it into an administrative unit. That was the law of these boundaries. After the British came, for purposes of administrative convenience they carved out states, provinces and presidencies. They have left the shores of this country. The people of India now have to rearrange these boundaries to their satisfaction. Unfortunately the cry of language and language patriotism developed to such an extent that instead of becoming in the eyes of some merely a means towards an end it became an end in itself. Nobody is to be blamed for this. If we begin to blame one another on this account, it is again our folly and fault. For some reason or other during the days of our freedom fight we thought, the

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

country thought, that it would be better to rearrange the administrative units on a linguistic basis for the purpose of administrative convenience. But this idea was carried too far. In many States and in many areas, instead of it being merely a matter of administrative conveniece, it became a matter of even worship. In one of the places I went to during the course of my tour, I saw a picture of a State being drawn in the form of a lady and worship being offered. (*Sri J. Mohamed Imam*: *Nothing wrong.*) This idolatry is not good. This is exactly an honest purpose being converted into fanaticism. We cannot cry 'Jai' to this Matha or to that Matha and thus forget Bharat Matha. If there is one song throughout India and if there is one anthem throughout India we cannot afford to develop any other loyalty which will undermine it. We should not allow such a psychology to grow. This House approved of the measure this Government took when we abolished the State song. That approval was given with a view to making people feel that there is a new loyalty and that loyalty is to India as a whole. I have seen for myself and I have no hesitation in saying that loyalties adverse to the fundamental loyalty to this nation should not be allowed to grow, should not be allowed to spread. I therefore plead that if we understand the context of India, the conditions of India and the necessities of the Indian situation, every one must agree that if uni-linguism is capable of creating mischief it ought to be prevented at the earliest moment.

Sir, Mysore State is justly famous for many things. It is not we in this House alone that are responsible for it. Our predecessors and forefathers have worked a great deal towards this consummation. It is indeed fortunate for us that we have been now called upon to give another lead in the right direction. I need not even claim the credit for this House or for this State for having initiated this idea. This idea was initiated by the leaders of the nation, the Prime Minister and a few others. They were not thinking in terms of this State or that State, conferring benefit on this State or that State or curtailing the prospects of this State or that State. They were broadminded enough, they were patriotic enough to see that the unhealthy forces that were released after the publication of the S. R. C. Report warranted a remedy, and that remedy was to do away, in effect, with the existence of uni-lingual States and combine them into one State. May be in that bigger State there may be one State or two States or three States as the case may be. Since this idea has emanated from people whose lead has profited this country for over half a century, whose heart is pure, whose mind is sober, it is incumbent on all of us to accept this idea with goodwill and grace. I have already said that this idea may not be capable of implementation here and now. If the idea of carving out linguistic States took more than 30 to 40 years to materialise, another idea may take an equally long time, more time or less time, I do not know how much time. The creation of linguistic States was accepted as one of the items of work by the Congress. Nevertheless it took a very long time. Even so, this idea will take a long time. Even as food, however delicious, takes time for digestion, ideas take time to be digested by the people as a whole.

My resolution is not conceived in a spirit of haste. It says 'for the rapid development of various areas'—that is one of the conditions—'and for ensuring the unity and security of India'—that is another condition; where there is any danger for the unity and security of India we have to act on the spur of the moment as it were. Even in England, the most democratic country in the world, when there is a war emergency all powers are assumed by the Government under the authority of Parliament. Things happen which normally do not happen in peaceful times when there is danger, emergency or war. It is very difficult to say that those conditions will not arise, with reference to India. All of us are aware that there are two powerful blocks in this world. The whole world is being divided into one camp or the

other under the leadership of Russia and the U.S.A. It is with great difficulty that we in India are maintaining a position of neutrality. Even that neutrality is being shaken now. America supplied arms and ammunition to Pakistan, because of the agreement they arrived at for some reason or other, which we need not discuss here. Pakistan is now threatening us. It is infiltrating here and there on our border. We are perforce put to the necessity of purchasing arms, may be from the U.K., may be from Russia. When arms are supplied in this fashion by one power block or another, you will ultimately find yourself in a position of inevitably using them. One famous statesman has said : 'To arm oneself is to be tempted to use it.' Let us pray that that contingency will not arise. But if it arises, we must be in a position to take every possible step in order to safeguard the unity and security of India. I do not want to analyse the world situation further, for every one of us knows it thoroughly well. I envisage that the Resolution that we may now adopt will help the future Legislature when a different solution is needed for the occasion on the basis of this Resolution. We are laying therefore a good foundation for our future. The immediate reason for me to move this Resolution is this : this House was divided in the matter of accepting the recommendation of the States Reorganisation Commission. Every one knows that a considerable number of members in this House remained neutral. When we accepted the S.R.C. Report. . . .

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—They had no objection.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Even if you presume that they had no objection, you will grant that they had no heart in it. When a new State is coming into existence, if you ignore the feelings of your own brethren, it will not make for happy and smooth sailing. Democracy is a form of Government whose life-breath is compromise. If you continuously ignore the minorities, that is the surest way of ultimately jeopardising the democratic way of life. The minorities must be happy, the minorities must entertain the faith that the majority will one day or some time later see and appreciate their feeling. It is mutual faith that is the basis for our assemblies and conferences, and if even a single individual feels that there is no possibility of justice, that there is no possibility of appreciation of his views, to that extent that frustration will be a cancer in the body politics. When a considerable number of members of this House have no heart in a particular course that we the majority of the members want to follow, we must halt for a while, think magnanimously and appreciate their point of view also. Happily for us they have also moved but moved faster than we the people who are called the majority did. If we have moved in the direction of expanding the State up to above 400 to 500 miles from Kollegal to Gadwal our friends have moved further, from coast to coast, from Cape Comorin to the Vindhyas. In fact that is a very welcome development and a happy development. Now in the matter of this race for expansion, let us come to a compromise. Let us agree and feel happy about it. It is this approach of mine to make every one in this House feel that his voice is heard, that his view is appreciated, that has prompted me to table this Resolution. Apart from the other consideration that I have put before this House, the inherent merit of this case, this is the consideration that ought to weigh with us here and now immediately. I am sure, all of you are anxious, as anxious as myself, that when the new State comes into existence, we must all feel happy about it. Unless you make people happy, our elation that we are bringing a new State into existence will be of little avail.

1-30 P.M.

So, Sir, I appeal to the Leader of the Opposition, as I did yesterday, to rise to the occasion, to be magnanimous and accept this Resolution wholeheartedly. That will create a condition for which our successors will be happy and grateful.

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

I now commend this Resolution to the unanimous acceptance of this House.

MR. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That this Assembly is of opinion that in the circumstances existing in India, for the rapid development of various areas and for ensuring unity and security of India, it is desirable, wherever and whenever feasible, to form bi-lingual States with regional Council for each lingusitic area."

There are two amendments tabled by Hon'ble Members Sri Srinivasa Iyengar and Sri B. Hutche Gowda. These amendments also can be moved so that both the Resolution and the amendments can be discussed together.

SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—(T.-Narasipur).—Sri Hutche Gowda is not here now and I am not anxious to move my amendment, Sir.

SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Sir, I request the Chair to kindly read the amendment for the information of the House.

MR. SPEAKER.—The amendment is :

"That after the word 'bi-lingual', the word 'multi-lingual' shall be inserted.

That the words 'regional Council for each linguistic area' shall be omitted."

SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, it is true that the Leader of the House gave me time to think over and see if we can come to an agreed conclusion. We have thought over the matter and I may make it clear, Sir, that if the Opposition disagrees it is not with any idea of causing embarrassment to the Leader of the House. First we are opposing it in a good spirit so that when a new and serious problem has been placed before this House all of a sudden, all the Members should have a chance to discuss the pros and cons and thrash out and come to a solution which is best in the interests of the country. Sir, I may submit that, so far as the reorganisation of States is concerned, when it took an active turn, myself and the Leader of the House have acted in unison and we have not treated it as a party matter. We have worked together, we have consulted together and we have toured together; and till yesterday, there was absolutely no difference. In fact, I credited him for the part he played in achieving this object. Now, Sir, suddenly when a new idea has been mooted, an idea which affects not only the present generation but commits posterity and the future generation, it is but right that, before we give our approval, our conscience must be satisfied and we must be satisfied that this new move is for the good of the country and for the good of the new State. Much as I respect the Leader of the House, during the last two or three days, I must say, he has become a mysterious personality. The procedure and the proceedings look very mysterious. There was a time, Sir, when he was a staunch advocate of the formation of Karnataka or the Bigger State of Mysore as it is now called : he swore by the linguistic State. And today, Sir, he has narrated the danger of uni-linguism which may be true or may be imaginary. Anyhow, I am not afraid of the consequence of forming uni-lingua-composite States. Nobody apprehendl the dangers. Nobody said that the unis linguistic State would lead to disunity and to disruption or that it would tend to retardation of the development of India.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—We have been saying it all along.

SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, I may be permitted to disabuse the mind of the Leader of the House that this Dakshina Pradesh move was sponsored or put forward by people who are of the view that linguism or unilinguism will lead to anti-soical activities. I must say, Sir, that unilinguistic States are not new to India. There are many States where people speak only one language. We have got the Uttar Pradesh. It is a big State and practically one language only is spoken. We have Bengal where again only one language is spoken. We have Bihar where only one language is spoken.

We have got, Sir, big unilingual States and have we had an opportunity to say that these States have not contributed to the prosperity of India or that their existence has tended to disruption or disunity at any time ? On the other hand, I must say they are most loyal and what is more, the country's biggest leaders have been drawn from these States. Our Prime Minister or the President of the Indian Republic and most of our leaders come from States where only a single language is spoken. Sir, this argument that the unilingual States will lead to disruption or disunity is of recent origin and has been put forward as a threat to the country's existence and safety. Sir, history is replete with instances where considerable trouble has arisen as the result of a State being bi-lingual or tri-lingal and this has tended to the disruption of the country, hampered its growth and prevented the development of the country. The idea of bi-lingualism or the existence of bi-lingual States is not new to India, or for that matter, even tri-lingual States. For instance, Madras was a multi-lingual State composed of Tamilnad, Andhra, Orissa and even Malabar. Central Provinces is a State where three languages are spoken. Punjab is a bi-lingual State. We had bi-lingual States from time immemorial. But then, how is it that there was a clamour in every one of these States that these composite States were not functioning properly and that the people wanted that uni-lingual States should be formed. This agitation is not of recent origin. It is an old claim. It has been there for the last quarter of a century. People of Orissa said that they did not want to live in a bi-lingual State. They formed a State of their own and after that they are quite happy. We do not see any internal trouble. Similarly the Andhras said that they would not remain as part of the multi-lingual Madras State and said that they would be quite happy with an Andhra State. Now they are quite happy. Tamil Nad is quite happy. In the same way, other States are also happy. It has prevented the mischief or the disruption that would be caused as a result of multi-lingual States ; but I am sorry to note that there is again a move for multi-lingual States and to revive the old troubles. Now, Sir, the present Bombay State is a bi-lingual State consisting of Gujaraties and Maharastrians. All the recent unhappy happenings and trouble are the outcome of a bi-lingual State. If Bombay State was a unilingual one, there would not have been all these troubles.

Sri SYDNEY A. THOMAS (Nominated).—What about minorities ?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—In every State there is that trouble. In every State there are people who speak different languages. There are people the majority of whom will speak one language and there are minorities who speak a different language. If we take Andhra, we find many people speaking Kannada ; therefore, there cannot be a State which could be a hundred per cent lingual. So, I cannot agree with the argument of the Leader of the House that the formation of unilingual States will cause disunity and may weaken the country. Sir, I must say that this argument is only a pretext for the formation of a bi-lingual State. I have already dealt with the adverse effects of the bi-lingual States. Knowing well the difficulties and troubles and the disadvantages of a bi-lingual State, people want unilingual States to be formed.

Sir, I may point out the advantages of the formation of a unilingual State. India is a country where there are too many languages, too many customs and different cultures. There are too many conflicts ; there are conflicts within the State and outside the State. If there are conflicts both within and outside the State, how can we expect any progress in the country ? Sir, it is absolutely necessary to establish homogeneity and remove heterogeneity. At least, if all the sources of trouble within the State is removed and a perfectly uniform atmosphere is established in the State all the minor bickerings will go and there will be homogeneous atmosphere in the State. Such States, undistracted by other troubles, will try not only for their own progress but also for the progress of

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

the entire country. The Leader of the House said that formation of bi-lingual States would lead to development of the country. Well, Sir, if that were so, why was there no development in the bi-lingual States all these years? The people living in such States were not satisfied with the development at all. Many minorities said that in a bi-lingual State, a certain section dominates and all the other sections are disregarded. Take the case of Bombay, the complaint is that Uttar Karnataka people are neglected. In the composite Madras State, the Mangalore people say that they are neglected. Similarly, the Andhra people said that they would form their own State so that they might strive better for the development of their own State. Therefore, the bi-lingual States, instead of contributing to the development of that area, will hamper its development. The internal disputes and troubles may grow to such an extent that we might again think of forming another Commission like the S.R.C. to go into the question of re-organisation of the States.

Sir, we have already taken a decision to form a big State called Greater Mysore. Now, the destiny of the future State should be decided by the representatives of all the interests in the future of this State. It is not merely that we are interested in the State but it is also those that join us in the near future. Therefore, it is the representatives of the entire Karnataka region that must take a decision in this behalf. There are the representatives of Mangalore, Hyderabad, and Uttara Karnataka. So, the proper occasion to come to a decision in regard to this issue is not now but after the formation of Greater Mysore. It looks very unfair on our part to take a decision behind their back. The future Assembly of Greater Mysore will contain 182 members; we are only half of that. Who are we to lay down a principle for them without consulting them? So, to be fair to one and all, this is not the time to consider this question.

The Chief Minister wants this Resolution to be passed even before the amendments are disposed of. It is rather mysterious. I have been studying the attitude of the Chief Minister. I know he is a staunch believer in unilingual State and in Karnataka. Even when he sponsored this Bill he said that there was no question of forming a Dakshina Pradesh because Madras did not want to join and Kerala was powerless and Andhra was also not very particular.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City—North).—The Hon'ble Member should not misquote. The Chief Minister said to keep the doors open.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—From what I gather from the speech of the Chief Minister in the Upper House, I find that he has put forward the formation of Dakshina Pradesh as a definite issue. There is a sudden change in the tone of his argument. It looks to me that this idea of Dakshina Pradesh has been introduced with a view to sabotage all the good work we have done. I know his sincerity. Yesterday, I saw his speech—if it is correctly reported—in the papers that he has found fault with the members of S.R.C. also. He said that the members of the S.R.C. have no administrative experience and that is why they have not taken the correct decision. It shows that the Chief Minister does not agree with the Report and naturally with the consequential change.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I have said, they have committed some mistakes.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, his advocacy for the formation of Dakshina Pradesh has really caused a great deal of suspicion in my mind and in the minds of those who are genuinely interested in the formation of Greater Mysore. Sir, the Centre is all powerful and I do not know what mandate he has received from the Centre in this matter. This is nothing but a move to entangle Mysore with the other States. So, when this Resolution is passed and goes to the Centre and the High Command, we may at once receive a mandate to stop the S.R. Bill and

consider the formation of Dakshina Pradesh. Sir, I have got great respect towards the leaders of the country. But, when they sponsor an idea and place it before the country, I am afraid, they do not consider its effects and its consequences. It looks they are experts in creating more problems and greater complications. When an idea is put forward, it must be considered from all aspects, as otherwise there will be trouble. As soon as the idea of Pradesh system was put forward, there was trouble in Bihar, in Madras and several other places. In Madras, there was hartal and there was firing and many people died. Then, the Kerala Government went to the ground on this issue.

SRI N. HUCHMASTHI GOWDA (Huliyurdurga).—Is it on this issue ?

SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Yes; anyway, there is no Government at present. Therefore, this is an indication of the danger of accepting a maxim unless it is examined in full.

Therefore, Sir, I am of the firm opinion that all the States must first be formed and then, if it is feasible, if it is necessary, we could consider the question of linguism. It may be necessary after some time to form some federation. As pointed out by my friend Sri Pattabhiraman, there is over-centralisation. All the powers are concentrated and this is nothing but another move to take more power into their hands. We must form an atmosphere wherein the States can stand on their own legs. So, a kind of federation in the South should be formed. When we are still at the middle of discussion on the Bill, to bring in another Resolution of this kind is really anomalous and is attended with dangerous consequences.

2 P.M.

I am afraid the Chief Minister has admitted that the theory of bi-linguism has been brought before this House to appease those that were not in favour of linguistic States. It is true there has been some difference of opinion. It is true some people wanted to have the State of Mysore as it is. But in course of those discussions in December nobody advocated, nobody said that we must have a very big State consisting of three or four States in South India. They were only for a small State whereas we wanted a viable State, a pretty big State so as to include all people speaking similar language, having similar customs and similar culture. Now those very people who were for a small State, have at once become broad-minded and want a big Pradesh of three or four States. They want to have a very big State. Before we attempt for the formation of a big State, why not first try the State of Karnatak ? It seems you are not very keen about a big State. On the other hand, your idea is to create as much trouble as possible and to see that the object of the S.R. Bill is defeated.

I may state the disadvantages of having bi-lingual or tri-lingual States. As it is, with a small composite State we are having a good deal of trouble in the development works. Sri B. V. Narayana Reddy yesterday attacked the Government, to the effect that the Government was unable to provide schools even to a small section of Telugu people. So when a bi-lingual State is formed, look at the enormous liability we have to shoulder. Supposing a State consisting of Mysore, Kerala and Madras is formed, there will be three different groups speaking three different languages with divergent customs, with different culture. What should be the lauguage of the State ? We Mysoreans want Kannada ; Kerala people want Maayalam ; Madras people Tamil. Which language should be the official language ? in which language the members should speak ? In these days, very few of our patriots know English well. Malayalees may prefer to speak in Malayalam ; Tamilians may prefer to speak in Tamil and we in Kannada.

SRI SYDNEY A. THOMAS.—What should happen to the national language ?

SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The Chief Minister says that Hindi cannot be imposed. That is a different issue. Which language should be the official language for the State formed ? It is attended with so many difficul-

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

ties. You just think what will be the consequences. Where should be the location of the High Court? Suppose Madras and Mysore go together; or Andhra and Mysore go together. Which should be the capital? Should it be Madras or Bangalore? Where should be the location of the High Court? So the formation of a bi-lingual State is attended with innumerable difficulties. If this is adopted, I am afraid the growth of the country will be retarded for at least quarter of a century. On the other hand, the Government gave a hope to all the people of India; they said: "Well, according to your wishes, we must form as far as possible linguistic States. We will give you viable units." Accordingly, they formed a Commission. The Commission gave a Report and every State has come forward and accepted it. Madras has accepted that it should be a unilingual State. Kerala does not want to join other States; Bombay State does not want to remain together. Similarly, Madhya Pradesh. Why is it that Mysore alone is so keen about it? Madras has not yet taken up this question. The adjoining provinces have not taken up this question. How is it that Mysore is so enthusiastic about it? It is this that gives rise to suspicion.

Sri SYDNEY A. THOMAS.—Mysore is giving the lead.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—When your lead is not likely to be accepted, why should you give it and risk your reputation? I tender an advice to another person only when I feel sure it will be accepted. Nobody is keen to join Mysore. Nobody has devoted any *attention to it*. It might be that it was an active question between Bengal and Bihar. But they are also disileusioned and there is a large volume of agitation. Again, why do you create fresh complications and fresh troubles? Till now this reorganisation of Mysore State was considered between ourselves as a non-party matter and now it is being considered as a party matter. I do not know what instructions the Government have received from their High Organisation. I am only interested in the progress of the country, in the unity of the country, in the development of the country. I am stating from the bottom of my heart that if you think of bi-linguism or if the Centre thinks of introducing States on bi-linguistic basis, they will be causing untold harm. The unity will be spoilt. The Chief Minister said that there will be greater unity of the country (India) if three or four States join together in the South and form one State. On the other hand, I may say there may be greater danger for the unity of India by the creation of Pradeshs. You may remember there is controversy between North and South, between Aryans and Dravidians. Supposing these four States join together, form a league and—I do not say 'conspiracy'—come to an understanding to defy the Centre feeling themselves strong; does it not lead to disunity? There is such a move. In fact, Sri Ramaswami Naicker says that all the people in the South are being dominated by Aryans who come from the North. On the other hand, unilingual States being smaller units which are helpless against the mighty Centre, there is little fear of any revolt or any threat on their part, because each State by itself will be quite helpless to defy effectively the mandate of the Centre and on account of the helpless condition of each State, there will be greater unity and solidarity in the whole of India than what it would be if Pradesh systems are formed. We feel that we must express what is good for the development of the country. And what is more, if the South feels that the formation of bi-lingual States is necessary, this is not the time. Otherwise, whatever confidence was reposed in Mysore by those who are going to join us will be lost. This is not the time. Let us form States; let all the recommendations be implemented. Afterwards when the representatives from various parts of the country are here, let us think over in good spirit and without fear or rancour and come to an understanding. On these grounds, *I feel* it is my duty to oppose the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In view of the heavy agenda to-day, may I request Hon'ble Members to cut short their speeches ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ (ಹುಲಿಯೂರು ದುರ್ಗ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಮಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಇಮಾಂ ರವರೂ, ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ವಾರ್ಸರವರೂ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರೂ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸ ತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕವಾದದ್ದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಭಾರತದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಾ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾದಂಥ ದೊಡ್ಡ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿ ಆ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಸುಭದ್ರವಾದ ತಳಪಾಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವಂಥ ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಇಂಥ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕವಾದುದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Don't make it a party issue. I am here to support the Resolution.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ಏನೋ ಅಲ್ಲೊಬ್ಬರು ಇಲ್ಲೊಬ್ಬರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ನೀಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಅವಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಈ ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಂಥ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಇಮಾಂಅವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕದವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆಯೇ, ಕೇವಲ ಇಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರವೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗಲಿ ಎಂದು ದಿವಸ ಹಾಗೆ ವಾದಿಸಿದ್ದವರು ಅದೇಕೋ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಮಾತ್ರ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಉತ್ತರ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕದವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯದೆ ನಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ನಾಳೆ ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಿಂದ ಬರತಕ್ಕವರೂ ಬರಲಿ, ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಅನಂತರ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ನಾವು ಈ ದ್ವಿಭಾಷಾ ಅಥವಾ ಬಹುಭಾಷಾ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡೋಣ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ದ್ವಿಭಾಷಾ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆ, ಅಪಘಾತಗಳಾಗುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಮದರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಗಲಾಟೆಗಳನ್ನೂ, ಬಂಗಾಳದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಗಲಾಟೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿ, ಕೇರಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರಿಂದ ಆ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಬಿದ್ದುಹೋಗುವಂತಾಯಿತು ಎನ್ನುವಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ, ಜನರು ಈ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಇಮಾಂ ಸಾಹೇಬ್‌ರವರು ತಿಳಿಸಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಗಲಾಟೆಗಳು ನಡೆದವು, ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ತೊಂದರೆಗಳುಂಟಾದುವು, ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಜನರು ಇದಕಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಾಣಗಳನ್ನೇ ತೆತ್ತರು ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಂಶಗಳೊಂದನ್ನೂ ಇವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಆ ದಿವಸ ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳು ಆಗಿಯೇತೀರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಬಂಗಾಳದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಒಂದು ಚಿಕ್ಕಪುಟ್ಟ ಘಟನೆಯನ್ನೇ ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡದನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಈಗ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಖಂಡಿತ ಯಾರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಬಾರದೆಂದು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇವರು ಈಗ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದರ ಅರ್ಥವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಮೊದಲು ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗಲಿ, ಅನಂತರ ಬಾಕಿ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡೋಣ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನೂ ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಇನ್ನೂ ಅನೇಕ ಜನ ಮಿತ್ರರೂ ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವನ್ನು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದೆವು. ಒಂದಾವರ್ತಿ ನಾವು ಈ ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ದ್ವಿಭಾಷಾರಾಜ್ಯ ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಅನೇಕ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಮಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಲು ಹೇಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಮುಂದೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದೊಂದಿಗೆ ಸೇರತಕ್ಕ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದೇ ಇದೆ. ಮದರಾಸ್ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯದಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಸೇರತಕ್ಕವರು ಮದರಾಸ್ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಬಹುದು. ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯದವರು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲೂ, ಹೈದರಾಬಾದಿನವರು ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಅವರವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಲು ಈಗಲೂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದೇ ಇದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾವೀಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅಷ್ಟು ಹೊರತು ಹೊರಗಡೆಯವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಅವರೂ-ನಾವೂ ಕಲೆತು ನಮ್ಮ ಎಲ್ಲರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಒಟ್ಟಾಗಿ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾವುಗಳು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕಾದು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದಂಥ ಅಗತ್ಯವೇನೂ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಲೀನ ವಿರೋಧ ಸಂಘದವರ ಹಿಂದಿನ ವಿರೋಧ ಈಗ ಹೊರಟು ಹೋಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಿಜ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ವಿರೋಧ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳವಾದ ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ದೇಶದ ಮುಖಂಡರುಗಳು ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯ ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಉಂಟಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು, ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ, ಬಂಗಾಳ ಬಿಹಾರದ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ದ್ವಿಭಾಷಾ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು, ನೆಹರೂಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಪಾದಿಸಿದರು, ವರ್ಕಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿದರು, ಮೇಲಾಗಿ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ದೊಡ್ಡ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷ ಎ.ಐ.ಸಿ.ಸಿ. ಸೆಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಈ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಮುದ್ರೆ ಒತ್ತಿದರು. ಆದಾದಮೇಲೆ ನಮಗೆ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಭಯವು ಬಹುಭಾಗ ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಆಯಿತು. ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಗಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವರು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಹೇಗಿದೆಯೋ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಭಯ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ)

ಇತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವಾಗ ಇಟ್ಟಂಥ ವಾದ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಅಲ್ಪಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಭಯವನ್ನು ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 'This idea may take equally a long time' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಒಂದು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಭಯ ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ವಿಷಯ ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಶ್ರೀ ಇಮಾಂರವರು 'it is vague' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು, 'It is not specific' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು, 'it is omnibus' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅನೇಕ ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದರು. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಇರುವುದೂ ಕೂಡ ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಯಾವಯಾವಾಗ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎಂದು ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಆಗಾಗ ಹೀಗೆ ಅನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ಕಾಲದವರೆಗೂ ಹೋಗಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಮೊದಲೇ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಆಗಬಹುದು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಅನೇಕ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ನಾನು ಮತ್ತೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದ ಈಗಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದ ಭದ್ರತೆ ಮತ್ತು ರಕ್ಷಣೆಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಭಾಷಾ ವ್ಯಾಮೋಹವನ್ನು ದಾಟಿ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಜಾತಿವಾದ ಎಷ್ಟು ಅಪಾಯಕರವೋ ಈ ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೋಗುವುದೂ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಪಾಯಕರ, ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅಪಾಯಕರ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ವ್ಯಾಮೋಹವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದ ಭದ್ರತೆಯ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಯುದ್ಧ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ, ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡು ದೇಶದವರು ಫ್ರಾನ್ಸ್ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದರು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹಿಂದೆ ಓದಿ ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇತರರೊಡನೆ ಸೇರಿ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದಂಥಾದ್ದು ಯಾವಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ? ಯುದ್ಧ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತ ಇದ್ದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ. ಈಗ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವಾಗ ಅಪಾಯವುಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಎಂಬ ಭಯ ನಮ್ಮ ಎದುರಿಗೆ ಇದೆ. ನೆಹರೂ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಅಪಾಯ ಇದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ಈ ದೇಶವನ್ನು ನುಂಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಗಳು ಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಗಳೂ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವ ಈ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ವ್ಯಾಮೋಹವನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಖಂಡಿತ ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳನ್ನಾಗಿ ವಿಭಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಪರಸ್ಪರ ದ್ವೇಷ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಈ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪಾಯವನ್ನು ಉಂಟುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪೂರ್ವಭಾವಿಯಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖಂಡರಿಗೆ ಈ ಬೆಳಕು ಬಂತಲ್ಲಾ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಸಂತೋಷಪಡಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಷಯವಿದು. ಅವರ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಅಗತ್ಯ. ದ್ವಿಭಾಷಾ ಪ್ರಾಂತರಚನೆ ಬಹುಕಾಲದವರೆಗೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದರೆ, ಒಟ್ಟು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನೇ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಆಮೇಲೆ ದ್ವಿಭಾಷಾಪ್ರಾಂತರಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ದಾರಿ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೊಡಗಿನ ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಕೊಡಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ವಿಲೀನವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದವರು ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದವರು ಎಂಬ ಇವೆರಡು ಗುಂಪುಗಳು ಇದ್ದುವು. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ರಚನೆ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಬೇರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಲೀನವಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದವರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದಿವಸ ಉಳಿದುಕೊಂಡ ಮೇಲೆ, ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿರುವುದೇ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟರು. ಈ ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತರಚನೆ ಆದ ಮೇಲೆ ಆ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿ ಮತ್ತೆ ದ್ವಿಭಾಷಾ ಪ್ರಾಂತ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದ ಒಗ್ಗಟ್ಟಿನ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದು ಸಾರ್ಥಕವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ಒಂದನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ಒಳಗಾಗಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಆ ದಿವಸ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಸಂತೋಷದಿಂದ ಒಮ್ಮುಖವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಇಚ್ಛೆ ನಮಗೆ ಇರುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ಒಂದರಲ್ಲಿ ದ್ವಿಭಾಷಾ ಅಥವಾ ಬಹುಭಾಷಾ ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ವಿಂಗಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri SYDNEY A. THOMAS.—Mr. Speaker, if it would do any good I would oppose the question of States reorganisation outright; because I feel that the leaders of the country are giving in to group pressures existing all round the country. I purposely refrained from entering into discussion on the States reorganisation during these many months because I felt that on account of group pressures we were groping in darkness. And today I feel that we have been given a lead in the right direction. The leader of the Opposition said that he was speaking from the bottom of his heart. I do the same. I have no political irons in the fire. I am, perhaps, in the unique position in this House of being beyond the linguistic pales. I am not in linguistic arena, and perhaps, I am an onlooker in this game. If I speak today, I speak in the interests of the country as a whole and Mysore as a consequence. History and historical forces are essentially dynamic. Merely because somewhere in 1920 the Congress accepted the principle of linguistic division

of the country, it does not mean that even after 20 or 30 years we should be stampeded into forming linguistic States. In the discussion on the S.R.C. Report, if I remember well, Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao said that the principle which the Congress accepted in 1920 served a definite purpose. It was one of the prongs of a many-sided attack in our fight to achieve freedom, and, as he said, it had served its purpose. I am always opposed to any tendency or even a semblance of tendency which might even remotely foster disintegration of the country. Because of that I viewed with grave misgiving the formation of the Andhra State, because I felt that it would set in motion a cycle of emotional influences which if left unchecked would end in the disruption of the country. And today we see the ugly hydra head of linguism rearing itself on all sides, so much so that the leaders of the country have been hustled into appointing commissions and placing the Bill before us. India today is one and unified. Not even during the reign of Asoka nor during the reign of Akbar did India attain this unity. Nor could it be said that the British brought about the complete unification in the country, because on one side we had the princely States and on the other we had the British Provinces. Unity came as a result of the unifying hand of Sriyut Vallabhbhai Patel. Even so that unity is not complete. On one side Pakistan is threatening on the question of Kashmir. The question of Goa remains unsettled. Even before we have achieved political consolidation we are seeking to divide ourselves on the question of reorganisation of States on some so-called rational basis. If at all there is any rational basis it is the one that is being sponsored in the Resolution, namely, to have bi-lingual or multi-lingual States. There are many arguments which can be used against the formation of multi-lingual States. Equally so has the Leader of the Opposition advanced arguments for the formation of what after all is a unilingual State, but these are out-weighed by the former. You may call it a composite State or any other State but it is unilingual State. Apart from administrative chaos which would result after the reorganisation of unilingual States there will be set up bitter inter-State dog-fights in respect of conflicting territorial claims. And in this fight for territorial claims a sort of communalism will be set up, a communalism more bitter than we have experienced in the past. We have seen it in the case of Bombay. That is a case in point. As it is we see that there is intolerance based on linguistic and regional fanaticism. When once these two fanaticisms become co-terminus, trouble would be accentuated thousandfold. The claim of Hindi as national language will recede and be relegated into background if not oblivion. The Leader of the Opposition said that in Tamil Nad, Tamil would be the language and in Kerala State Malayalam would be the speaking language. If we are going to have a national language, how is it going to come about? Each State would become politically water-tight and only the regional language would be allowed to flourish. What would happen to the minorities then I do not know. Even in a composite State like Mysore, we do not have any more Telugu schools being opened when there is a demand for it. In Andhra we find the same. I understand that in Andhra no Tamil schools have been opened for the last two years. So we find that each State would become a water-tight enclave not only linguistically but also politically.

2-30 P.M.

Sir, the idea of the common nationality would soon go. Freedom of movement, and of opportunity would become things of the past, and gradually forces of disintegration and secession will grow. This disintegration would have the final seal placed on it when an Opposition party comes into power in one of the States. This Opposition party will do everything to defy and encourage forces of secession and would do everything to fight the Centre. That would become another enclave and gradually we find disruption setting in. I believe, Sir, that no

(Sri SYDNEY A. THOMAS)

amount of linguistic division would ensure that unilingual State. In every unilingual State, there would be a minority, and there will be a permanent majority in a position permanently to dominate over, and even to tyrannise the minority. In a multi-lingual State, the position of the majority would be somewhat qualified and conditioned.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to close the discussion on this Resolution before lunch. Please be brief.

Sri SYDNEY A. THOMAS.—Sir, I believe there has been so much of slogan-mongering that balkanisation would set in. I sincerely believe that this is true. In a multi-lingual State, we see that people speaking different tongues profess that they cannot live together; but then we are preaching the principles of *panch shila*. People of the same Hindu religion, speaking different languages, cannot co-exist in one State and how are we to preach these principles to the world? Is it only for export, I ask you, Sir?

Since you want me to close soon, I shall do so, while wholeheartedly supporting the Resolution before the House.

Sri K. S. VASAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, I rise to oppose this Resolution. Sir, the spirit of this Resolution as I have understood is repugnant to the spirit of the Bill that we are discussing now. Sir, whatever the understanding of others, the underlying principle of the redistribution of States as embodied in this Bill is linguistic; and we have considered and generally discussed that Bill and given our consent to it. Now at the next stage of considering the Bill clause by clause, we are faced with a resolution asking us to agree for a bi-lingual State. So, I hold that this Resolution is opposed to the very spirit of the Bill we are discussing (*He r, hear!*). The phrases 'unity of India' and 'security of India' have been used only to camouflage new theories that are propounded to thwart the democratic movement of our country, and arguments are advanced which I am not able to understand. Unity of India which is desired by all, can be achieved only when all the diverse nationalities of our land and the Indian languages flower to their full height, and that can never be ensured in a bi-lingual State and bi-lingual States formed of such people speaking different languages cannot unify the country. Far from it, such a move would disrupt the entire nation. Sir, leave alone unifying the entire country by the formation of bi-lingual States, it cannot even unify the Congress Party as it is in this State now and in other States in India at present. Sir, this way of experimenting with the people and their destinies was there for more than a century, practised by the British Rulers and it was known to be against the national aspirations of the people. That was why the national movement had assured the people that when the country became free, all the States would be redistributed on the basis of language; and now all these arguments are advanced of unity, disunity, security and national development—naturally to flout the pledges that had been given to the people. This slogan of bi-lingual States, far from ensuring unity, will generate disintegrating tendencies and disrupt the country. Anybody with a clean conscience would concede that the national movement for linguistic redistribution of the States had never disunited the people. On the other hand, it had united the people for fighting the cause of freedom. It had united the people with a patriotic fervour.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—That was against the common enemy.

Sri K. S. VASAN.—Sir, it is a fact that there are disputes and disagreements over border adjustments. That can very well be settled in a democratic manner by the Boundary Commission taking the language spoken by the majority of the people in those territories as the basis and taking the village as the unit.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—Is that a scientific basis?

Sri K. S. VASAN.—It may not appear to be a scientific basis for you. Sir, it is stated that those who fought

for linguistic provinces have very nearly created balkanisation in the country. History would have it otherwise. It is those who opposed the linguistic formation that have taken advantage of this situation created by border disputes, to incite the communal passion and rouse indignation of the people and create such a dangerous situation—and having created such a situation and taking advantage of this they attack the very principle of the linguistic provinces. Even here, Sir, I had occasion to talk to some of my Hon'ble colleagues here who some time back advocated the policy of Mysore for Mysoreans only, but now stand for larger, bi-lingual or tri-lingual or multi-lingual States. I asked them how it is that they have changed. They told me, they have not changed at all. Their stand is stated to be: they opposed Karnataka then and they oppose Karnataka now. They said that they opposed because they feared that a particular community would dominate in the event of Karnataka being formed and even now it is why they do not want to have Karnataka. I do not want to give out their names.

Sir, let me proceed. Experience has shown that bi-lingual or tri-lingual or multi-lingual States prevent the full participation of masses of people in the administration of the State and in the political, economic, social and cultural life of the nation. It is only C.R. who now wants some place somewhere who can oppose this idea. He has no place in Madras.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not want personal references to be made.

Sri K. S. VASAN.—Sir, let not interruptions be in the nature of provocations. The proposal for bi-lingual State is in my opinion a weapon against the democratic movement in this country and such a move would thwart the progressive forces of the country. Sir, it is still fresh in my memory that the Hon'ble Leader of the House some time back, while addressing a gathering outside, said that he would agree to a linguistic redistribution, but not for Mysore being particularly sandwiched between the east and west or between north and south. It is only such considerations by persons in places and positions of power or prompted by communal forces that are up against this national, patriotic urge of the people for linguistic redistribution of the States.

Sir, before I conclude, I wish to quote what Mahatma Gandhi wrote in *Harijan* in 1948 just a few days before he was murdered. Particularly when the disciples of Mahatma Gandhi have forgotten what he preached and lived for, I think it is useful to refresh their memory with this quotation. Sri Mariappa just now said that the Congress propounded the theory of linguistic States only because there was a common enemy. Let me read this for his benefit:

> "Redistribution of Provinces on linguistic basis was necessary if provincial languages were to grow to full height. Congress has already adopted that principle and has declared its intension to give effect to it constitutionally as soon as they come to power as such redistribution alone would be conducive to the cultural advancement of the country. . . ."

With these remarks, I vehemently oppose this Resolution placed before this House as it deserves to be thrown out.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wholeheartedly support the Resolution which has been so ably moved by the Hon'ble Leader of the House. It deserves the serious consideration of the members of this Assembly. The merit of this Resolution is that it brings in all the advantages of a unilingual State, and in addition to those advantages this Resolution is going to rectify the deficiencies that will be there in a unilingual State. This Resolution which is more applicable to the southern part of India, will automatically have the effect of solving the question of linguistic minorities. All the people speaking a particular language will come under one Government and one administration and all the people who speak another language will also come in larger

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

numbers. As I said day before yesterday, if a bi-lingual State consisting of Andhra and Mysore were to be formed, all the Telugu speaking and the Kannada speaking people will come under one administration and there will be no question of linguistic minorities. Therefore all the bitterness that may be there in a unilingual State, and all the disadvantages and sometimes atrocities that may be committed on linguistic minorities, will not be there. Further, as the Chief Minister has rightly put it, it is for the developmental work and for the progress of the country and also for the speedy implementation of the ideal that we all want it to be implemented; the socialist structure of India can be easily and expeditiously attained. Sir, we are now moving in an age where time and speed are of utmost consideration. We have got to change our ideas according to the necessities and need of the time. Sir, we all know that Sri J. Mohamed Imam was one of the most loyal subjects of Mysore. He was more loyal than the king himself. He was one of those who protested when the Mysore Flag was removed though he knew that continuation of Mysore Flag was not in consonance with the Constitution of India. Now, he has changed his views about the kingship, about the loyalties; he is changing his loyalty from the King, from the Mysore State to Karnataka State. So, Sir, change is the essence of progress. Whatever might have been said by the leaders of India regarding the formation of linguistic States, those conditions do not prevail today. The objective conditions warrant us to think afresh. With the dangers that are confronting the country today, with the move of America through Pakistan, the danger to India is imminent at any time. The Sword of Democles is hanging on us. When such is the position, if we allow the linguistic division of India wherein each State will try to fight the other and to advance against the interest of will be other and each claiming areas belonging to the other, there will be so much of bitterness, anger and there will not be any peace, nor unity and oneness in the country. Those that advocate the unilingual State aspect, forget about the unity of India, the greatness of India and the solidarity of India. Sir, we have witnessed very bitter experiences that have occurred after the announcement of the decision of the Government of India regarding the S.R.C. Report. What happened in Bombay, in Belgaum and Orissa? If that is not enough to open our eyes and think afresh, we will remain static and we will remain blind to the facts. Sir, when we all cherish that the people of India should progress and that India should have a right place in the comity of nations, we should avoid all things that are going to create bitterness in the minds of the people. I therefore feel that the Resolution tabled by the Leader of the House is timely. Of course, there is a snag in the Resolution: 'wherever' and 'whenever'. Let it be clearly understood that the people of Mysore should give a lead not only in passing this Resolution but also to state clearly and unequivocally that a bi-lingual State of Andhra and Mysore should be formed here and now. Then only the reorganisation of the States would be complete in the interest of the people of India. Thank you, Sir.

SRI T. MARIAPPA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am indeed surprised at the stand taken by Sri Mohamed Imam. I thought that he would bring to bear on this occasion a very dispassionate view of things. But, unfortunately, his imagination seems to be clouded, perhaps, on the ground that the Bill before this House is either abandoned or is going to be abandoned. Significantly, Sir, he happened to remark that the move on the part of the Chief Minister seemed suspicious. I do not know wherefrom he got this inspiration. Sir, after all, this Resolution is most innocuous. It is only an affirmation of a very salutory principle conceived in the very best interest of India.

The States Reorganisation Commission had advocated a composite State for Bombay—a *bilingual* State—not for the fun of it but for the conditions

that exist in that State. What they did not indicate clearly or explicitly happened to pass soon after the Government of India's decision on the Report was published. Sir, leave alone happenings in Bombay. Take the case of Orissa; what happened there? They wanted certain territories both from Bihar and Andhra. For the mere desire to get a little territory from their neighbours, violent acts happened in that State. The leaders of the country had no axe to grind and therefore they said that when passions run riot, it is but right that wise counsel should prevail and solutions evolved calmly. They did not condemn the formation of linguistic States. They said that language should be the main consideration, and that alone should not be the governing factor in the matter of reorganising the States or redistribution of boundaries. What is now happening? We have got the Bill before this Assembly concerned on the basis of language; but, there is also the other idea. If my friend reads further portion of the Resolution, he will see that provision is made for the full growth of the language and there will be regional Council for each linguistic area. Two languages are sought to be brought together, two principles are sought to be reconciled not now, not tomorrow, but when favourable circumstances exist. When Indian unity is in jeopardy, when, perhaps, linguistic passions run very high and when people, perhaps, begin to fight for a little village mainly on the ground of language, at that particular psychological period this Resolution comes to our aid. (*Interruption*) Sir, it was a life's mission to bring about unity in this country. The leaders have fought hard for the achievement of freedom. It would be very easy for those who never struggled for the freedom to say anything now. Of course, it is open to them to say anything they feel like saying. But let them listen to the advice of the leaders of the country. After all, most of them are very old. What they have achieved now, they will pass it on to the next generation. Therefore, Sir, the leaders said: whenever and wherever bi-lingual States could be formed, think of them. There is also a condition precedent for the formation of such a State, namely, the agreement between the two parties. Therefore, let not my friend run away with the idea that it is going to be formed immediately without the consent of the parties concerned.

If my friend could only read to-day's papers, the Minister for Agriculture, Shri Bhaktavatsalam, while replying to the debate in the Legislative Council, Madras, has said that this idea is kept open. They have not closed the door. It may, of course, take sufficient time. Perhaps, tomorrow all the people that come to Karnataka may themselves desire the union of two larger States in the larger interest of the Indian unity. Suppose, India stands in danger due to aggression from outside. Every man in this country will have to bend every nerve to safeguard the integrity, unity and security of India. Therefore, let us not quarrel with the words; let us accept the underlying principle of this.

Sir, I would only say on this occasion that this principle was evolved not by a few individuals but by the representatives of the great Congress Organisation which met at Amritsar. If the idea has not yet become popular in the country, it is because enough propaganda was not made in this behalf. That principle does not apply to Mysore or to Madras or Kerala alone, but it applies to all the States in India. Therefore, the wording of the Resolution is designedly vague in order to see that other parties also get accustomed to this idea and there is enough propaganda. Even the narrow provincialism will have to be got over. Therefore, when favourable circumstances exist, two or three parties sit together and think of this whether it is desirable to form a bi-lingual State; if they feel it desirable, they may take further steps in the matter. I would, therefore, very humbly suggest to this House that there is nothing to look at this Resolution with an eye of suspicion. Such a move should be welcomed. It is a principle over which there could practically be no dispute because there is no State today in

(SRI T. MARIAPPA.)

India which is purely unilingual. There are pockets where many languages flourish. Even in Bangalore we have got Tamil Association, Malayalam Association; Kathakali dances are performed in the Town Hall under the very nose of my friend Sri Vasan. I understand Sri Vasan belongs to a party which swears to principles of an outside country. They are now swimming in troubled waters. Sir, take the case of Russia. There are federations within federation. There are bi-lingual States in Russia; there are autonomous regions within a sub-federation. Therefore, enough provision is made for the constitution of regional councils, and there need be not even the remotest apprehension that the language is going to be affected by the constitution of regional councils or the apprehension that even the local culture is going to be affected. Sir, yesterday, rules governing these regional councils, so far as Punjab was concerned, were placed on the Table of the House of the People. Hon'ble Members must have read those rules. In Punjab, Sikhs were fighting for a separate State. When they discussed the whole question in the larger interest of Indian unity, when they found that their border was threatened, wiser counsels prevailed and today there are two Councils one for the Punjabi and another for Hindi. It is not beyond human ingenuity to evolve rules where two languages could exist. So, nobody need run away with the idea that this is going to cut at the roots of culture. It is not even going to affect the formation of Karnataka. So, with a view to take everybody with us, even though they do not see eye to eye with us, we must find a solution and that solution has resulted in the moving of this Resolution. I hope now I have been able to dispel some of these doubts and some of my friends and the other friends opposite would see their way to accept it.

3 P.M.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—But for the personal accusation the Leader of the Opposition made against me, I would have had no occasion to make a reply speech. He said that I am a mysterious man and I have changed my ideas about the formation of States. If at all anybody has changed his views, it is my friend the Leader of the Opposition. For the last three years I have been consistently advocating that the composite character of the State must be maintained. That is a very well known fact within the knowledge of everybody in the House. At no time have I said that States must be formed purely on the basis of language. Leave alone my statement of policy. The very resolution accepted by this House to which the Leader of the Opposition and his party have subscribed wholeheartedly and willingly, reads as follows:

> "This Assembly is further of opinion that in order to preserve its composite character, the new State should continue to be called 'MYSORE STATE'."

That is one idea. Then, such other contiguous areas in which the people have expressed their desire to join the new State are welcome to come into the new State. These are the two clauses of the resolution that we accepted on the first of December. The underlying idea of these two clauses makes it clear that this House never voted for a unilingual State. If I have sponsored a resolution of the kind that I have done to-day, it is exactly in consonance with the idea contained in clause (f) of that resolution: "such other contiguous areas in which the people have expressed their desire to join the new State." Therefore this House and the world will judge whether we have changed our opinion or the Leader of the Opposition and his followers. Even to-day Mysore State as it exists now or as it is going to be after the first of October, let me tell the Leader of the Oppsition, is a bi-lingual State. It is not a unilingual State. So I do not want anybody to accuse me that I have changed fronts, and I have not behaved in a mysterious fashion. I am merely carrying out the mandates of this

House stage by stage and step by step. When the idea of Dakshina Pradesh was discussed, it has taken shape in the form of a resolution that this House, I have no doubt, will accept. At the time when we discussed the resolution in December there was no such idea and therefore there was no occasion for us to discuss it. Then the idea took shape in a resolution of the Congress Party in India. Naturally the party system of Government transforms those decisions into resolutions and enactments of the Legislature. It is for this reason that this Resolution has come before this House. I may also state for the benefit of my friend that it is not now that I am advocating the idea of Dakshina Pradesh. Two months before the S.R.C. Report was published, I made a speech at Madras when the Mayor of that City was good enough to give a party to me. In that meeting, the Chief Minister of Madras and other Ministers of Madras Government were present. I do not want to read the long extract. I said there:

> " . . . The people of India are one people. There was no question of their being the people of Madras, Mysore or Travancore-Cochin. If these States had come into existence . . . , under the Constitution it was merely for administrative convenience. If administrative convenience demanded that they should readjust the boundaries of these States on the lines suggested by the Mayor of Madras, he for one would not stand in the way. . . ."

The Madras Mayor suggested in his speech that for the good of all the South Indian States, a new State called Dakshina Pradesh be formed. I never spoke anything against that idea. What I said then was, let people understand and digest this idea. Now people have to think about it. It may be that there is not sufficient enthusiasm for it now, and that is conceded. Otherwise in the Resolution itself I could have said, let Mysore join Madras, Kerala or any other State as the case may be. Other States have not expressed their opinion, nor have we taken a decision for the immediate fromation of that State. What is sought to be done is to keep our minds open. Even the Leader of the Opposition in the course of his speech said, let us not consider it now but subsequently after the formation of the new State. There is not much difference between me and the Leader of the Opposition. Whether we pass this Resolution or not, if that idea emerges, the new Legislature has to consider it and give its decision. Otherwise there is no question of any new State coming into existence. Therefore, the right of the new Legislature is not taken away. We here say this is our opinion. It may be taken into consideration by the new Legislature, or it mav not be taken into consideration. But what prevents our expressing our opinion on a subject of such importance ?

Another point, a very serious point, made by my friend the Leader of the Opposition was that we did not consult the other people, the representatives of the people of Madras, Bombay and Hyderabad areas that are joining this new State. There he was playing to the gallery.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I find this is the second time he is using these words. I remember yesterday he used the same words. He said I am playing to the gallery. It is not a proper expression to be used against me. On the other hand, I wanted to level a similar charge against the Chief Minister but out of consideration I did not make that remark.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Very good. I will not press my argument on that. He may have been trying to win for himself what is called public opinion in other parts of Karnatak. It is true, some of them are strongly against this idea of joining any other State. (Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—*They are all Congre smen*). They all want to have this new State exactly as it is and they are dead against this idea of taking any other set of people into the new State. In fact, wires are pouring into my hands even as I am sitting in this House that I should withdraw this Resolution. I just sent a

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

reply to this effect : "This Resolution that I am moving is in the very terms of the resolution adopted by the Amritsar Congress Session and this Resolution has been accepted by the Congress party in the Mysore Legislature. Therefore, the question of withdrawal does not arise." Let us not blow hot and cold at the same time. There was no doubt a difference of opinion in this House even when the original proposition came up for consideration. Why did not the Leader of the Opposition then suggest that we should consult the other people of Uttar Karnatak, before we took a decision on the resolution that we accepted in December? He did not ask me or the House to consult the other set of people when we adopted the name of Mysore. If on two such occasions, when important questions were involved, he did not think it convenient to consult the other set of people, why should that argument be taken now? In fact, we have been functioning on parallel lines. The friends of Hyderabad, Bombay and Coorg are taking decisions of their own in their respective Legislatures. We have been taking our own decisions in this House. We have not yet reached the stage of sitting in the same forum discussing and coming to a decision. That stage will come. Before that stage comes, if you argue' 'why don't you consult those people, it will be like putting the cart before the horse. There is also practical difficulty. I have discussed with them and I have tried my best to make them see the point of view of the Mysore Legislature. They hold their views in a much stronger fashion than any member of this House does. Therefore, even if I consult them it is very difficult to make them agree at the moment. Probably they will feel more irritated. The very wires that are being sent to me are proofs. They think that a leader of the party can move any resolution at his pleasure and withdraw it when he wants. Therefore, I have been suggesting on the floor of this House that a time will come when they and we will meet on the floor of this House. We will then be able to see each other's point of view, effect reconciliation and become what is called one harmonious House. That time will come. Let that time come. Let not that argument be advanced for voting aganist this Resolution.

Sir, the Leader of the Opposition said that this Resolution is being sponsored in order to sabotage the S.R. Bill or the coming into existence of the new State of Mysore. Far from it. I would assure him and those of his way of thinking that this Resolution is being sponsored in order to help the establishment of the new State in a much better and more harmonious way than the Leader of the Opposition can think of or imagine. I have already said that it is the harmonious atmosphere that is necessary much more than technical majorities and decisions of such majorities. We must not try to get at things by means of what is called a technical majority. I assure him that if this Resolution had been sponsored, it is mostly with a view to helping the smooth passage of this Bill and to safeguard the harmonious atmosphere for the formation of the new State.

He said, Sir, that the bi-lingual States were there, they were tried and they were found wanting and therefore unilingual States came into existence or are coming into existence. If he follows the logic he will see that these multi-lingual States or bi-lingual States worked wonderfully well for over a century and a half. It is we Congressmen who make and unmake things that brought about the disintegration. Before this language consciousness was raised to the plane of conscience and patriotism and what not by propaganda, people did not know any difference between men who speak Telugu or Tamil or Kannada or Malayalam. They never knew what difference there was between them. They lived like the members of one family. Their administration was never conducted on the basis of language. It was a perfectly harmonious State. It is only latterly that propaganda in favour of unilingual States was carried on to such an extent that people lost their balance and evil consequences followed. We

know therefore, after the publication of the S.R.C Report, what havoc this idea had done to this country and to its fair name. We therefore must think; if we have sense enough to think, we have to revert to the old order of things which ensured brotherly feeling and a happy atmosphere. It is more in the way of repentance—I do not hesitate to use that word—I have brought forward this Resolution in order to establish the past position that prevailed, the desirable position that prevailed when the States were multi-lingual or bi-lingual as the case may be.

Sir, the Leader of the Opposition has made up his mind. I am very sorry that he did not come with an open mind. Even now I would appeal to him. This has been a question discussed as a non-party question. From the very beginning we have discussed and we have dealt with this problem in that happy spirit. After the explanation I have given and after clearing my *bona fides* in the matter, I hope, my appeal will go to convince him and his friends to vote for this Resolution. That will be a very happy augury for us to work as members of the new Assembly that is to come into existence. I request that this Resolution may be accepted unanimously by this House.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is:

> "That this Assembly is of opinion that in the circumstances existing in India, for the rapid development of various areas and for ensuring unity and security of India, it is desirable, wherever and whenever feasible, to form bi-lingual States with regional Council for each linguistic area."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet at 3-55 P.M.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Twenty-Five Minutes past Three of the Clock and reassembled at Four of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956.

Clauses—(contd.)

4 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER.—Now clause 15. There are amendments tabled by Sri Hutche Gowda. He is not here. Sri Rajasekhara Murthy is not moving his amendment. Sri K. Pattabhi Raman may move his amendment.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—Sir, I beg to move:

> "That clause 15 of Part III be deleted from the Bill."

Sir, I would suggest, if you are agreeable, to move a more appropriate amendment suggesting the deletion of clauses 15, 16, 17 and 18 and all the clauses of Part III may be taken together and as regards putting them to vote, I will leave it to you. If you will permit me I shall modify the amendment to this extent.

MR. SPEAKER.—Yes.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Therefore, "I move That all these clauses 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 of Part III may be deleted."

Sir, even when I was making my general remarks on the Bill, I have indicated the reasons why I particularly chose to request this House to delete Part III entirely. I feel, Sir, the suggested appointment of Zonal Councils does not serve any useful purpose at all. In fact, one has merely to see the Constitution of the proposed Zonal Councils, in order to find out how far it will have any effective voice in shaping either the policy or the programme of the future States to be. Each Zonal Council, especially with reference to certain States in the South, has got a fixed representation as it were. The Chief Minister accompanied by two Ministers—who are certainly responsible to him and own joint responsibility with him—and then the Chief Secretary and the Development Commissioner—who are public functionaries working under the Government of the time, go there. Therefore,